

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated July 11, 2005, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims. The allowance of claims 14 and 15, and the indication that claims 4-9, 20 and 24 contain allowable subject matter, is noted with appreciation. In response thereto, claim 20 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 7, 8 and 9 have been amended to ensure proper antecedent basis for claim terminology.

Claims 1-3, 10-13, 16-19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the grounds that they were considered to be unpatentable over the previously-cited Huff et al patent (US 6,408,391) in view of the newly-cited Ko et al patent (US 6,789,202). It is respectfully submitted that the Huff patent does not suggest the subject matter of the rejected claims to a person of ordinary skill in the art, even when considered in light of the Ko patent.

For example, one of the features recited in the claims is the step of developing a recovery model to recover from an intrusion of the network. See claims 3 (which has now been incorporated into claim 1), 13 and 21. In rejecting these claims, the Office Action asserts that the Huff patent discloses a recovery model at column 10, lines 61-67, and column 11, line 1. It is respectfully submitted that this passage in the Huff patent does not disclose the concept of a recovery model, as that term is employed in the context of the present invention.

More particularly, as described on pages 20 and 21 of the present application, the concept of "recovery" refers to returning full control and authority of the network back to the appropriate party, once an intrusion has occurred. Examples of recovery techniques include retransmission attempts until a message is successfully sent and, if this is not possible, identifying and using other radios and/or signal carriers to provide an alternative communication architecture. If a determination is made that a radio has been lost to an adversary, a recovery action may be to disable the radio, to prevent compromise of friendly communications.

The cited passage in the Huff patent does not disclose recovery attempts of this nature.

Rather, it is directed to the dispatch of countermeasures. A countermeasure is designed to prevent, or thwart, an attack on the network. It is not the same as recovery, in which control of the network is returned to the original owner after an intrusion has occurred. In other words, the countermeasure is effected while the attack is taking place, whereas recovery occurs if the intrusion was, in fact, successful. It is respectfully submitted that the Huff patent's disclosure of dispatching countermeasures upon detection of an intrusion does not teach, nor otherwise suggest, the development of a recovery model to *recover* from an intrusion.

For at least this reason, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Huff patent does not suggest the subject matter of the pending claims, whether considered by itself or in combination with the Ko patent.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: January 10, 2006  
By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
James A. LaBarre  
Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620